

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>Chad R. Wortman,</b>	)	<b>CASE NO. 5:15 CV 558</b>
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	<b>JUDGE PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN</b>
	)	
<b>Vs.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Commissioner of Social Security,</b>	)	<b><u>Memorandum of Opinion and Order</u></b>
	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	

**INTRODUCTION**

This matter is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge George J. Limbert (Doc. 28), recommending that the Court equitably toll plaintiff's motion for attorney's fees (Doc. 25). In addition, the Court has reviewed the motion and finds that the amount of the fee request is reasonable. No objections have been filed. For the reasons that follow, the Report and Recommendation is ACCEPTED and attorney fees are awarded in the amount of \$15,108.00. This represents 25% of the retroactive benefits awarded to plaintiff. Upon receipt of this sum, counsel for plaintiff will remit the previously awarded Equal Access to

Justice Act Fee of \$7,500.00 directly to plaintiff.

### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

When objections are made to a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the case *de novo*. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) provides in pertinent part:

The district judge to whom the case is assigned shall make a *de novo* determination upon the record, or after additional evidence, of any portion of the magistrate judge's disposition to which specific written objection has been made in accordance with this rule. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended decision, receive further evidence, or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

As stated in the Advisory Committee Notes, "When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." In *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985), the Court held, "It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings."

### **DECISION**

This Court, having reviewed the Report and Recommendation and finding no clear error, hereby accepts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation as to the appropriateness of tolling. In accordance with that recommendation, together with this Court's finding as to the reasonableness of the rate, the Court hereby awards attorney fees in the amount of \$15,108.00. Upon receipt of this sum, counsel for plaintiff will remit the previously awarded Equal Access to Justice Act Fee of \$7,500.00 directly to plaintiff.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Patricia A. Gaughan  
PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN  
United States District Judge  
Chief Judge

Dated: 6/25/20